

Appln. No. 09/648,132

Amendment dated June 21, 2004

Reply to Office Action mailed January 28, 2004

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Entry of the above amendments is courteously requested in order to place all claims in this application in allowable condition and/or to place the non-allowed claims in better condition for consideration on appeal.

Claim 15 remains in this application. Claims 1 through 14 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

Parts 1 and 2 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 3 and 12 through 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breed (GB 2301922) in view of Harris Jr. (4,687,305).

Claims 4 through 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breed (GB 2301922) and Harris Jr. (4,687,305) in view of Bauer (5,808,778).

It was alleged in the Advisory Action that the "[t]he proposed amendments to claims 3 and 6 are to the extent that they require further search and more careful consideration since the newly proposed combination in claims 3 and 6 have not been discussed in the previous Office Action..." Despite this contention, the language of claim 3 as requested to be amended in the (first) response to the final Office Action merely incorporated the requirements of claims 1 and 2 into claim 3, and as claim 3 has always depended from claims 1 and 2, did not present any new combination that the Examiner was not presented with in the first Amendment. Similarly, the proposed amendment of claim 6 merely sought to include the requirements of claim 1 and 2 into claim 6, and as claim 6 as always depended from claims 1 and 2, rewritten claim 6 also did not present the Examiner with any

Appln. No. 09/648,132

Amendment dated June 21, 2004

Reply to Office Action mailed January 28, 2004

new combination of requirements that had not already been presented to the Examiner in the first Amendment.

Despite this erroneous statement in the Advisory Action, and in order to expedite prosecution of the case to a Notice of Allowance, all claims except for claim 15, which has been indicated as being allowable since the first Office Action, have been cancelled from the case, and allowance of the case is requested.

Part 3 of the Office Action

Claim 15 has been allowed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.

By 

Date: 6/23/04

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.
3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250
Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5807
(605)339-2028 FAX (605)336-1931